RAB Minutes

NAS North Island
Restoration Advisory Board

INTRODUCTION
The sixty-fifth Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island/Naval Amphibious Base (NAB) Coronado was held on Thursday, April 20, 2000, at the Coronado Public Library from 6:30 p.m. 7:35 p.m. Ms. Fargo called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., and welcomed RAB members and the public.

RAB ATTENDANCE
Daniel Cordero, Bill Collins, Carla Fargo, John Locke, Art Van Rooy, Bob Geilenfeldt, Foster Marshall

PUBLIC/NAVY ATTENDANCE
Mark Bonsavage, Neal Clements, Humberto Tessada, Jerry Bailey, Nancy Lee, Debbie Wankier, Mark Wankier

APPROVAL OF MARCH 16, 2000 MEETING MINUTES
The RAB members approved the March 16, 2000, meeting minutes.

MEETING TOPICS
The April 17, 2000 meeting topics were the Update - Site 10 Extended Remedial Investigation; EPA Technical Outreach Services for Communities (TOSC) and RAB Community Co-Chair Office; Update - Site 9 Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) with Steam Injection and Free Product Recovery.

PRESENTATIONS
Site 10 Extended Remedial Investigation - Mark Bonsavage, SWDIV, Remedial Project
IR Site 10 is the shoreline area towards the northern bend of the island. Site 10 is an old scrap yard, a Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO). A DRMO is a location where the military either recovered or disposed of different types of materials. There were two previous cleanups at the site: One was at the DRMO itself to cleanup the yard of scrap metal and PCBs; Secondly, there was a removal action at the shoreline area where an area of slag was removed that had a radium component to it. This site had been used to melt down airplanes, and in the airplanes there were radium dials. As a result, small amounts of radium were found in the slag material.

A remedial investigation of the shoreline area at Site 10 is now complete and is out for review. It is located in the Coronado library for viewing and comments. In addition, the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is currently being worked on. It's part of the removal action where the results are evaluated to determine if a removal action is necessary and what it might cost. The revised EE/CA is expected on May 15th.

The second large document in a removal action is a Remedial Action Plan (RAP), which will be ready for public review on July 24th.

A remedial investigation has primarily three parts. The first is to determine the nature and extent of the contamination. The second is a Human Health Risk Assessment-cancer risk, calculations from the concentrations at the site are used to determine if there is any immediate hazard from the contaminants. The third is an Ecological Risk Assessment to determine the impact on the environment.

Mr. Tessada asked, "Mark, do you have any idea now of how much of that slag has washed into the bay and what the radiation is ?? what the exposure is?"

Mr. Bonsavage answered, "I would say that typically it would be between like 5 and 30 picocuries per gram."

The material at Site 10 is a combination of ash and slag. The slag is a solid metal-like material, but the ash is where the concern is. It was discovered that the ash is mobile and contains high metals. Sample locations were set up to determine if the material along the shoreline was eroding or moving out into the bay or if it was in the bay in high concentrations. About a dozen metals including cadmium, copper, mercury were looked at. The conclusions were that the beach area posed no significant risk and that there is no significant risk from the groundwater. However, the ash and slag in the cliff poses the only potential risk. To address this potential risk, a removal action was initiated. The priority was to minimize the erosion of the slag waste material in the shoreline bluff and cliff area. Erosion is what makes the ash mobile and is what moves it to the receptors. To minimize the migration of metals and radium to the groundwater, four different alternatives were considered; containment with a rock revetmentand cap; containment with a seawall; excavating and segregating the slag wastes; and excavating and off-site disposal. After considering all the alternatives, the best choice was to build a seawall and a rock revetment, with a dirt fill on top, and then cap it. The idea of containment is to get some type of buffer system between the material and any potential receptors of the contaminated material.

EPA Technical Outreach Services for Communities (TOSC) and RAB Community Co-Chair Office - Bill Collins, SWDIV RPM

As was discussed last month, the EPA provides a program to communities that have SuperFund sites or accelerated problems that need to be cleaned. There is a need for somebody to work with the EPA and RAB. Mr. Geilenfeldt has volunteered and stated that he is willing to work with the EPA and RAB as needed. It was put to a vote and Mr. Geilenfeldt was approved as the liaison between the RAB and the EPA TOSC.

Ms Fargo asked, "Is the limit of Ms. Masters' involvement just on Site 9?"

Mr. Collins answered, "Just on Site 9."

Ms. Fargo suggested an alternate Community Co-Chair would be needed as a result of her business schedule. Mr. Locke indicated that Mr. Bob Logan was interested in the Co-Chair position. Ms. Fargo apologized for her absences and that she didn't want to step down. She suggested an alternate Community Co-Chair as an option. Mr. Collins stated that a vote would be taken at the next meeting.

Dr. Marshall then made a motion that the RAB go to quarterly meetings and call meetings more frequently if needed. The motion was approved and the upcoming meetings will be in May, August, November, and February.

Update - Site 9 Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) with Steam Injection and Free Product Recovery - Bill Collins, SWDIV RPM

Since last month, the steam system has been turned off. The last day of injecting steam was April 14th; and since that time free product, the fuel with the TCE contamination and soil vapors, continues to be recovered. At this time plans for full-scale implementation at the site are being prepared. This technique may be tried at Area 3, which is on the far side of Site 9.

At Area 3, the removal action was completed. The risk that was present from the chlorinated hydrocarbons was lowered. The first phase of the removal was completed, and a report that will document that is being issued. A recommendation to go back and install a system similar for Areas 1 and 8 will be part of that report.

Ms Fargo asked, "What do you anticipate the total volume of the LNAPL free product is at Site 9?"

Mr. Collins answered, "Well, there's a gross range running from 300,000 gallons to 600,000 gallons…by

using many different techniques, we may recover more than you would normally expect because we are using soil vapor extraction and also improving the pumping using the steam to heat up the LNAPLs. It flows very easily."

Mr. Tessada asked, "Bill, how much percentage do you expect to recover out of the entire plume?" Mr. Collins replied, "In a normal fuel plume, they get 40, 50 percent. It's fuel but it's also DNAPLs, the heavier liquids, too."

Mr. Tessada then asked, "What happens to the other half?"

Mr. Collins answered, "Some will naturally attenuate and for some we may have to come in a third and fourth time with other techniques that are also good."

Mr. Collins finished by stating that the Navy is performing both free product recovery and soil vapor extraction at the site.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
Ms. Fargo reminded all presenters to provide a copy of their presentation to the attendees.

UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS
CEQA
Deeper contaminants at Site 9
RI Update
Status of all twelve sites
Site 9 Removal update

RAB UPCOMING MEETINGS, YEAR 2000
May 18th, August 17th, and November 16th.
(Note: Next year's calendar will be determined at the November 16th meeting.)

MEETING ADJOURNED
Ms. Fargo concluded the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.